

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary**

Claims 45-71 were pending. Claims 1-44 were previously cancelled. Claims 45, 52, 58, 64 and 69 are amended and claim 72 is added herein. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendments may be found in page 7, lines 10-16, and support for new claim 72 may be found in Figure 5 and the associated text, namely page 17, lines 1-3, as well as elsewhere throughout the Specification.

As a result of the present response, claims 45-72 are pending and under consideration.

### **Claims 69-71**

There is no current rejection pending against claims 69 and 71. Thus, it appears claims 69 and 71 are allowable. In addition, while claim 70 is mentioned in the rejection over Robertson, claim 70 is dependent on an allowable independent claim (claim 69) and thus is also allowable due at least to its dependency.

### **Rejection of Claims 64-68**

Claims 64-68 were rejected under 35 USC 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 64 has been amended herein thus obviating the rejection of the claims. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Rejection of Claims 45-68**

Claims 45-68 and 70 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,609,106 to Robertson (Robertson). Applicants respectfully disagree. In the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended 45, 52, 58 and 64 claims to particularize the claims to exclude the embodiments at issue, instead leaving only embodiments that are clearly not taught by the reference. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit these claims are allowable. However, Applicants reserve

the rights to pursue the original/previous presented claims in one or more continuation applications.

Amended claim 45 now provides a method of operation, performed by a device, comprising receiving by the device, from a first server of a first service provider, a request for registration information for a user of the device, the registration information requested including one or more personality characteristics; the device causing a second server of a second service provider to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics to portray a desired persona, the one or more personality characteristics being based at least in part on content of a service provided by the first service provider, the second service provider providing a personality service; and transmitting by the device, or the device causing the second server to transmit, the personality profile to the first server to respond to the request. The cited reference, Robertson, fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 45.

Robertson provides a gift registry system in which a user may be requested to provide, and a user may provide in response, registration information. The system of Robertson provides a centralized repository for a user to register their desired goods in a gift registry (Wish List). As an initial step in the process the “user registers with the Gift Registrar by providing user information (name, address, phone number, etc.) and notice trigger events (holidays, special events, etc.) to the Registrar.” As can be seen, the registration step of the process is a fairly typical registration step used in a variety of on-line systems requesting a user to register before beginning use of the system.

However, claim 45 does not recite such a registration process. Claim 45 rather provides for the device causing a second server to dynamically generate and provide a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics. The citation of Robertson for teaching a user filling out a registration form thus overlooks the recited features of claim 45 as identified above.

It appears that the Office Action is attempting to equate the user’s Wish List in Robertson with the personality profile of claim 45, thus equating registered goods with personality characteristics. In Robertson, a Wish List is a list of goods the user wants to purchase or receive as a gift such as would be provided in a standard gift registry. A gift registry provides a list of specific items, typically by SKU number, or other identifier, to

assist someone in purchasing the identified item for the user. By contrast, claim 45 recites “personality characteristics.” As set forth in the Specification “personality characteristics” comprise “personal information” and one or more hobbies, interests, likes, dislikes. And “personal information” includes one’s name, address, and telephone number. Such “personal information” is often requested and sometimes required by content and/or service providers and other on-line resources in association with the processing of e-commerce transactions and other communication sessions, such as on-line chat sessions. In addition, dependent claims 51, 57, 63, and 67 specifically recite certain personality characteristics in accordance with the Specification. One of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably interpret personality characteristics as used in claim 45 and discussed in the Specification to include a list of goods in a gift registry. Thus, registered goods and personality characteristics are not the same thing.

In addition, in Robertson, the Wish List is created by the user, whereas the personality profile, according to amended claim 45, is dynamically generated by a second server (different from the first server, and the dynamic generation caused by the device). Amended claim 45 has deleted the language “generating by the device” and “or provide from a database.” The latter deletion has eliminated the possibility for the Examiner to misconstrue and read the latter deleted phrase in complete isolation (as opposed to properly reading the latter deleted phrase in conjunction with the leading phrase “the device causing the second server to dynamically provide”). Thus, the generation/provision by a second server of a personality profile having one or more personality characteristics is quite different from a user creating a Wish list in a gift registry.

Further, in claim 45, the personality characteristics that are provided to the first server are based at least in part on content of a service provided by the first service provider (the party requesting the registration information). Such a feature is supported in the Specification, for example from page 11, line 13 to page 12, line 8, in which the provided personality characteristics are determined from information about the service(s) offered by the service provider. The recited feature defines the provided personality characteristics in part by the services offered by the service provider. No such teaching is cited in Robertson.

The Office Action noted that the one or more personality characteristics based at least in part on a service provided by the first service provider may be interpreted to equate to the user communicating with a service provider using an email address. First, this interpretation has no foundation in Robertson, and no portion of Robertson has been cited for providing such a teaching. Second, Applicant disagrees with the substance of the assertions raised in the Office Action. In the stated scenario, the Office Action has interpreted the service as “communication”. In the present response, the language of claim 45 has been clarified to note that it is the content of the service provided by the first service provider on which the particular personality characteristics are based. As indicated at page 11, lines 13 to page 12, line 8, a user may submit a personality profile to a golf website that highlights the users interest in golf (i.e., the content of the site (golf website) may affect the particular personality profile generated/provided to the website). The hypothetical example provided by the Examiner is not based on a cited reference and is also not substantively aligned with the features of claim 45. Thus, as described above, claim 45 is patentable over Robertson.

Claims 52, 58, and 64 contain language similar to that of claim 45 and thus are patentable over Robertson for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 45.

Claims 46-51, 53-57, 59-63, and 65-68 are dependent, directly or indirectly, on claims 45, 52, 58, and 64 and thus are patentable over Robertson for at least the same reasons discussed above.

In addition, the Office Action indicates that claims 47-48 do not carry any patentable weight. The lack of consideration given to the features of claims 47-48 is based on the selection by the Examiner of one feature from among alternatives in claim 45. The amendment to claim 45 has made the Examiner’s ignoring of the recitations of claims 47-48 no longer possible, since the recitations of claims 47-48 clearly narrow the remaining embodiments recited in claim 45.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 45-72 are in condition for allowance and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2844. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: August 18, 2008

/Steven J. Prewitt/  
Steven Prewitt  
Reg. No. 45,023

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Stes. 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204-3795  
Telephone 503.222.9981